

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. Claims 1-11 and 13 are rejected as anticipated under §102 by Ray US 6,289,083. This basis for rejection is traversed, as the Ray patent relates to a Call Center environment, and not a PBX environment, as described and claimed in the application.

More particularly, independent claim 1 recites "A method for identifying to a public safety answering point the location within a campus from which a telephone call originates, where the campus uses a private business exchange to communicate with the public safety answering point, which private business exchange includes a port at which the origin and destination telephone numbers of each call are produced, said method comprising the steps of:

coupling at least said destination telephone numbers associated with each said call from said port of said private business exchange to a first computerized database, said first computerized database relating at least one of said destination telephone numbers to a particular emergency category;

in response to at least those of said calls associated with a destination telephone number relating to said emergency category, addressing with said source telephone numbers a second database preloaded with information relating the source telephone numbers to the location of the source telephone, to thereby determine the location of said source telephone; and

displaying to said public safety answering point at least the locations of those telephones which

are the sources of calls addressed to telephone numbers associated with said emergency category." the underlined matter of which is not found in the Ray reference.

Independent claim 6 includes matter of the same general nature

"6. A method for identifying to a public safety answering point the location within a first campus and a second campus from which a telephone call originates, where the first campus uses a first private business exchange to communicate with the public safety answering point, and the second campus uses a second private business exchange to communicate with said public safety answering point, said first and second private business exchanges each include a port at which the source and destination telephone numbers of each call handled by the associated one of said first and second private business exchanges, respectively, are produced, said method comprising the steps of:

coupling at least said destination telephone numbers associated with each said call associated with said first private business exchange to a first computerized database, said first computerized database relating at least one of said destination telephone numbers to a particular emergency category;

in response to at least those of said calls associated with said first private business exchange which are associated with a destination telephone number relating to said particular emergency category, addressing with the corresponding source telephone number a second computerized database preloaded with

information relating the source telephone numbers of said first and second campus to the corresponding locations of said source telephones in said first and second campus, to thereby determine the location of said source telephone within said first campus;

coupling at least said destination telephone numbers associated with each said call associated with said second private business exchange to a third computerized database, said third computerized database relating at least one of said destination telephone numbers to an emergency category;

in response to at least those of said calls associated with said second private business exchange which are associated with a destination telephone number relating to said emergency category, transmitting at least said source telephone number to said first computerized database; and

displaying to said public safety answering point at least the locations within said first and second campus of those telephones which are the sources of calls addressed to telephone numbers associated with an emergency category."

which first and second PBXs are not found in the Ray reference, nor are the interactions therebetween found in Ray.

Independent claims 1 and 6 completely distinguish over Ray, and are patentable in a §102 sense thereover.

Dependent claims 2 and 3 further recite matter which distinguishes over Ray, namely

"2. A method according to claim 1, wherein said

port connection of said private business exchange is a serial port.

and

3. A method according to claim 2, wherein said serial port connection of said private business exchange is an RS232 port."

Independent claim 6 has corresponding dependent claims.

Ray makes no mention whatever of a serial port or an RS232 port, and claims 2 and 3 further distinguish thereover in a §102 sense.

More generally, a call center is not the same as a PBX, so the claimed invention distinguishes over Ray for that reason. In addition, even if a call center be deemed to be equivalent to a PBX, which it is not, other recitations of the claims, such as the coupling of the telephone numbers to a "database relating at least one of said destination telephone numbers to a particular emergency category" further distinguish over Ray.

2. Claim 12 is rejected as obvious over Ray in view of Aprile. Claim 12 ultimately depends from claim 6, which as noted above is patentable. Claim 12 is therefore patentable as depending from a patentable parent claim.

The recitations of claim 12 can only be understood by reference to its parent claim 11

"A method according to claim 6, wherein said step of transmitting at least said source telephone number to said first computerized database includes the step of transmission over a network connection."

And Claim 12 recites

"A method according to claim 11, wherein said step of transmission over a network connection includes the step of conversion to TCP/IP format." which means that the step of transmitting the "source telephone number to said first computerized database includes the step of transmission over a network connection" using TCP/IP.

Examiner suggests that claim 12 is obvious over a suggested combination of Ray with Aprile. Such a combination requires a proper nexus. A proper nexus is not made out simply because one of the references describes or shows an element of the claimed invention, instead there must be some showing, either in the references themselves, or by Examiner's argument based on science and logic. In the present instance, Examiner does not state that the references themselves make such a suggestion. Instead, Examiner states *inter alia* (page 4 of the Office Action)

"However, Aprile teaches the desirability of transmitting detailed location information over the Internet as an alternative medium (column 4, lines 40-44) such that it would have been obvious . . ." This is the only mention of the Internet in Aprile, and it does not relate to the same matter as claim 12. The matter that is transmitted over the Internet in Aprile is that which allows

"individual employees to view and maintain their own ALI [Automatic Location Information] information over an intranet, extranet or the Internet via one or more web-based interfaces. In such a case, preferably the ALI information manager 20 is configured to provide user logins with multiple security levels to prevent unauthorized modifications to ALI information."

It is clear that it is ALI update and maintenance information which is contemplated as being transmitted over the Internet in Aprile, not the actual "source telephone number" as recited in claim 12.

Consequently, claim 12 is patentable as depending from an allowable parent claim, and is also patentable over Ray in view of Aprile because there is no proper nexus for Examiner's suggested combination of Ray with Aprile, and further because, even if Ray is combined with Aprile notwithstanding the lack of a proper nexus for such combination, the resulting structure does not meet the recitations of claim 12.

3. Reconsideration and allowance are requested of claims 1-13.

4. Please charge the fee for the extension of time and any other fees to deposit account 50-2061.

FOR THE APPLICANT(S)

by William H. Meise

William H. Meise
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 27,574

November 8, 2005
Duane Morris LLP
P.O. Box 5203
Princeton, NJ 08543-5203
609-631-2453